



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,826	02/05/2002	Densen Cao	5061.10 P	1012

7590 11/16/2004

Parsons, Behle & Latimer
Suite 1800
201 South Main Street
P.O. Box 45898
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0898

EXAMINER

LEWIS, RALPH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3732

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/072,826	Applicant(s) CAO, DENSEN	
	Examiner Ralph A. Lewis	Art Unit 3732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Rejections based on Prior Art

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 8-14, 16-20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Logan et al (US 6,692,251).

Logan et al disclose a dental curing light having a secondary heat sink 39, primary heat sink 36, semi conductor chip 30, protective cover 40 and light reflective device 43.

In response to the present rejection applicant argues that "Logan's non-imaging optical focusing device 44 is NOT a light reflective device, and it does NOT incorporate the particular geometric relationships in a light reflector claimed by Applicant" (6/14/2004 response, page 9). The examiner notes, as specified in the rejection that element number 43 of Logan et al was being interpreted as the claimed "light reflective device." Element 43 has a parabolic light reflective surface 42.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills (WO 99/16136) in view of Doiron et al (5,698,866).

Mills discloses a dental curing light (page 1, second paragraph) comprised of a hand held wand (Figure 5) having a light module 47, an elongated heat sink 45, 50, 51, having a distal end surface serving as a mounting platform on which primary heat sink 48 is mounted and light emitting semiconductors 43 mounted to the primary heat sink 48. Doiron et al, however, teach that an improvement over mounting diodes on a flat surface (Figures 9 and 10) is mounting them in a well (or cone) (Figures 11 and 12) so that more light from the LEDs is reflected forward in the desired direction. To have mounted the Mills LEDs in wells as taught by Doiron et al so that more light is reflected forward in the desired direction would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In response to the present rejection applicant argues that the "Neither Mills nor Doiron discloses Applicant's claimed a light reflective device, and neither Mills nor Doiron discloses the particular geometric relationships in a light reflector claimed by Applicant" (6/14/2004 response, page 9). The examiner disagrees, the wells taught by Doiron et al (see Figures 11 and 12) meet the limitations of applicant's claimed "light

reflective device.” To have used such wells in the Mills device in order to improve its efficiency as taught by Doiron et al would have been ordinary skill in the art as is set forth above in the rejection.

Claims 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (US 6,692,251). One of ordinary skill in the art in constructing the Logan et al device would have found it obvious as a matter of routine to have constructed the Logan et al within the range of dimensions claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-7 are allowed. The prior art fails to teach nor fairly suggest the claimed arrangement with a well on the primary heat sink in addition to a light reflective cone connected with an elongate heat sink as particularly claimed in combination with the other specified elements

Action Made Final

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3732

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Ralph Lewis** at telephone number **(571) 272-4712**. Fax (703) 872-9306. The examiner works a compressed work schedule and is unavailable every other Friday. The examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver, can be reached at (571) 272-4720.

R.Lewis
October 28, 2004



Ralph A. Lewis
Primary Examiner
Au 3732